

### REMARKS

By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-12 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-5, 7 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,433,652 to Hattori et al. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hattori et al. Claims 6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,661,441 to Morino et al. in view of Hattori et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record is a dielectric resonator that includes a protrusion portion disposed on a bottom surface of a dielectric resonance element, wherein "a side face at an outer periphery of the protrusion portion is tilted such that an area of an upper surface of the protrusion portion adjacent the bottom surface of the dielectric resonance element is larger than an area of a lower surface of the protrusion portion," and "the lower surface of the protrusion portion is fixed to a mounting substrate."

Hattori et al. is directed to multimode dielectric resonator where the resonator has both a TM mode dielectric core portion 11 and a TE mode dielectric core portion 12 as shown in Fig. 12B. The resonator of Hattori et al. is supported in the air by a low-dielectric support in a casing 2. If the resonator of Hattori et al. were fixed on a mounting substrate, the multiple mode functionality thereof would be destroyed.

Accordingly, Hattori et al. does not teach or suggest the resonator as defined in independent claim 1.

Morino et al. does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Hattori et al. As admitted on pages 4-5 of the Office Action, Morino et al. does not teach or suggest the structure of the protrusion portion of the dielectric resonator as defined in independent claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that one of skill in the art would have no motivation to combine the teachings of Morino et al. with those of Hattori et al. to arrive at the present invention as defined in independent claim 1. As noted above, in order for Hattori et al. to have a multiple mode functionality, the resonator of Hattori et al. must be supported in the air and not mounted on a substrate. Thus, one of skill in the art would have no motivation to combine Morino et al. with Hattori et al. because to do so would destroy the multiple mode operability of the resonator of Hattori et al.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as defined in independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art of record.

Claims 2-12 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and include all of the limitations found therein. Each of these dependent claims includes additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of the claims from which they depend, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record. Accordingly, claims 2-12 are likewise patentable.

Application No. 10/532,222  
Amendment dated November 17, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2006

Docket No.: M1071.1928

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of the amendment to claim 1, and allowance of the present application with claims 1-12 is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Dated: November 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Richard LaCava

Richard LaCava

Registration No.: 41,135  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
41st Floor  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 277-6500  
Attorney for Applicant